

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/734,015	Applicant(s) KEIGHTLEY, KYM JOHN	
	Examiner Christopher Boswell	Art Unit 3676	

All Participants:

(1) Christopher Boswell.

(2) Clay Cunningham.

Status of Application: pending

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 23 June 2005

Time: 2:00 pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 6, and 12

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner suggested changing the limitation of both "a cavity" in claim 6, and "a cut out" in claim 6 to recite the limitation--an aperture-- to better define the limitation. The examiner further suggested including the limitations of claim 13 into claim 12 to further define the interaction between the first arm and the rack. The applicant's representative agreed to the suggested changes.